



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/791,853

03/04/2004

Ryo Takeshita

US-163

5567

38108 7590 06/18/2008

CERMAK & KENEALY LLP
ACS LLC
515 EAST BRADDOCK ROAD
SUITE B
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

MARX, IRENE

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1651

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/18/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/791,853	Applicant(s) TAKESHITA ET AL.	
	Examiner Irene Marx	Art Unit 1651	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 May 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,9 and 10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 9-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 5/19/09 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1 and 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 is vague, indefinite and confusing in that the nature of the "processed product of cells of said *Escherichia coli* strain" cannot be determined from the Markush recitation provided, which includes items such as

- cells treated with acetone,
- lyophilized cells,
- a cell-free extract prepared from the cells treated with acetone,
- a cell-free extract prepared from the lyophilized cells
- a cell-free extract prepared from said *Escherichia coli* cells,
- a membrane fraction fractionated from the cell-free extract,
- an immobilized product of the *Escherichia coli* cells,
- a cell-free extract, and
- a fractionation product.

The material intended by "processed product" is at least ambiguous and confusing. No clear distinction can be made between the various "cell-free extracts" prepared in various ways and "cell-free extract" *per se*. Also, no clear distinction can be made between the various "cell-free extracts" and "a membrane fraction fractionated from the cell-free extract" and "a fractionation product" *per se*, and "cell-free extract" *per se*. The nature of the various products

Art Unit: 1651

intended cannot be readily assessed, even when interpreting the claims in light of the as-filed specification.

Claim 9 is incomplete as depending on cancelled claimed 8.

To clarify the invention, "MMO" should be fully spelled out.

Claims 1 and 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Colby *et al.*

The claims are directed to a method of making an alcohol of 1-8 carbon atoms from an alkane with a processed product obtained from a transformed *E. coli* cell, wherein the cell is a recombinant microorganism.

Colby *et al.* disclose the biotransformation of methane to methanol using a cell-free extract obtained from *M. capsulatus*. Even though the source of the extract is not a recombinant microorganism which does not inherently use an alkane, the nature of the enzymatically active cell-free extract is deemed to be the same, since the same proteins are involved in the bioconversion. See, e.g., Figure 1.

"[E]ven though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process." In re Thorpe, 777 F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985) (citations omitted) (Claim was directed to a Novolac color developer. The process of making the developer was allowed. The difference between the inventive process and the prior art was the addition of metal oxide and carboxylic acid as separate ingredients instead of adding the more expensive pre-reacted metal carboxylate. The product-by-process claim was rejected because the end product, in both the prior art and the allowed process, ends up containing metal carboxylate. The fact that the metal carboxylate is not directly added, but is instead produced in-situ does not change the end product.).

Furthermore, the composition used is claimed as a product-by-process. Since the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office is not equipped to manufacture products by the myriad of processes put before it and then obtain prior art products and make comparisons therewith, a lesser burden

Art Unit: 1651

of proof is required to make out a case of prima facie anticipation/obviousness for product-by-process claims because of their peculiar nature than when a product is claimed in the conventional manner. MPEP 2113. Where the claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical in structure or composition, or are produced by identical or substantially identical processes, a prima facie case of either anticipation or obviousness has been established. In re Best, 562 F.2d 1252, 1255, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977). "When the PTO shows a sound basis for believing that the products of the applicant and the prior art are the same, the applicant has the burden of showing that they are not." In re Spada, 911 F.2d 705, 709, 15 USPQ2d 1655, 1658 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Therefore, the prima facie case can be rebutted by evidence showing that the prior art products do not necessarily possess the characteristics of the claimed product. In re Best, 562 F.2d at 1255, 195 USPQ at 433.

Therefore, the claims are deemed to be anticipated by the reference.

Claims 1 and 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Colby *et al.* taken with Lloyd *et al.*, Stainthorpe *et al.* and West *et al.*

Colby *et al.* disclose the biotransformation of methane to methanol using a cell-free extract obtained from *M. capsulatus*. Even though the source of the extract is not a recombinant microorganism, the nature of the enzymatically active cell-free extract is deemed to be the same, since the same proteins are involved in the bioconversion. See, e.g., Figure 1.

Lloyd *et al.*, disclose the bioconversion of methane to methanol with *M. trichosporium* (See, e.g., page 461, paragraph 1) and also disclose that the genes encoding for soluble methane mono-oxygenase have been cloned and sequenced. See, e.g., page 462, paragraph 4. In addition, the reference teaches a method of culturing mutant strains of *M. trichosporium* which have lost the ability to inherently use an alkane (page 466, paragraph 1) and which have been transformed with soluble methane monooxygenase genes such that the recombinant microorganisms become capable of using an alkane such as methane (page 465, last paragraph). That the transformed microorganisms make at least some methanol can be presumed from the disclosure at page 461, from which it is clear that at least some of the methane used is biotransformed to produce at least some methanol.

The reference differs from the invention as claimed in that it does not disclose the production of an alcohol such as methanol wherein the transformed microorganism is

Art Unit: 1651

Escherichia coli. However, West *et al.* disclose the transformation of *E. coli* with methane monooxygenase genes, that are expressed. In addition, Stainthorpe *et al.* discusses the genetic composition of the mono-oxygenase from *Methylococcus capsulatus*.

Accordingly, one of ordinary skill in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success in transforming *Escherichia* or other suitable microorganisms with the genes obtained from strains of a *Methylococcus capsulatus* strain, for example, for the production of an alcohol from an alkane.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to modify the process of Lloyd *et al.* by using a transformed strain of *Escherichia* as taught by West *et al.* for the expected benefits of reducing the concentrations of atmospheric methane by producing methanol from methane in an economic and efficient manner.

Thus, the claimed invention as a whole was clearly *prima facie* obvious, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Irene Marx whose telephone number is (571) 272-0919. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (6:30-3:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G. Wityshyn can be reached on 571-272-0926. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300 .

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Irene Marx/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1651